

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/617,722	LAI ET AL.	
	Examiner Ryan M. Stiglic	Art Unit 2112	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to amendment filed January 19, 2006.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 14 and 18-20.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date _____. | 7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____. |

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Jun Lee Registration No. 40,262 on April 11, 2006.

The application has been amended as follows:

Claim 14 on page 2 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 "detecting whether said connection port is being used by said host controller;" has been replaced with --detecting whether a first connection port of said at least one connection ports is being used by said host controller;--.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 "when said connection port is being used by said host controller" has been replaced with -- when said first connection port is being used by said host controller--.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 "when said connection port is not being used by said host controller" has been replaced with -- when said first connection port is not being used by said host controller --.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “detecting whether a connection is established through said connection port” has been replaced with -- detecting whether a connection is established through said first connection port --.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “when said connection is established through said connection port” has been replaced with -- when said connection is established through said first connection port --.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “when said connection is not established through said connection port” has been replaced with -- when said connection is not established through said first connection port --.

Claim 14 on page 3 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “for reconfiguration of said connection port responsive thereto” has been replaced with -- for reconfiguration of said first connection port responsive thereto --.

Claim 19 on page 4 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “detecting whether said connection port is being used by said host controller;” has been replaced with --detecting whether a first connection port of said at least one connection ports is being used by said host controller;--.

Claim 19 on page 4 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “when said connection port is being used by said host controller” has been replaced with -- when said first connection port is being used by said host controller--.

Claim 19 on page 4 of the amendment originally filed January 19, 2006 “when said connection port is not being used by said host controller” has been replaced with -- when said first connection port is not being used by said host controller--.

2. The following is an examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance:

The applicant alleges, in the Remarks filed January 19, 2006, “As shown very clearly in Fig. 2B, however, such timer-based alternate operation is effected by Hannah’s apparatus through an altogether different communication link from that utilized for the host controller (page 8 of 10).” Furthermore, applicant alleges on page 9 of the Remarks filed January 19, 2006, “This teaches diametrically away from any method which looks to ‘whether a connection is established through ... [a] connection port,’ and examines ‘whether said connection is established within ... [a] predetermined waiting period for reconfiguration of said connection port responsive thereto,’ as Claim 14 now clarifies.” Applicant’s arguments are persuasive and the rejections of claim 14, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been withdrawn. The Hannah reference teaches, “...in each of the illustrated embodiments, the host controller and peripheral devices are respectively connected to Hannah’s USB hub through different respective ports, using communication links respectively dedicated thereto (applicant’s Remarks page 8)” and therefore does not teach and/or

fairly suggest determining the connection of a host controller or a peripheral device using a predetermined waiting time employed to reconfigure said first connection port responsive thereto. In other words, the Hannah reference is deficient in showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the Matsuda reference in order to determine the presence of a connection with a host controller or a peripheral device and switch the mode of operation of a dual role device because the Hannah reference teaches detecting the presence of a host controller on a first port and switches operational modes to act as a host on a **separate** port in the absence of a connection on the first port. Since Hannah does not teach determining the presence of a connection of a host controller or peripheral device on a single port and changing operational modes in response to inactivity, the combination of Matsuda in view of Hannah fails to teach and/or suggest each and every limitation of the independent claim 14.

Independent claim 19 is allowable for the reasons of record.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled “Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance.”

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Kanai et al. (US 20040153597A1) discloses a multifunctional device capable of switching operational modes. While Kanai teaches that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to implement a system that automatically determines the type of device connected, to the dual role device, and thus be able to switch operation modes Kanai fails to teach using a predetermined waiting period for determining the connection of a connection port and reconfiguring said connection port responsive thereto..
- Lin (US 20030212841A1) discloses a bridge device that operates in two distinct modes. A first mode is entered when only one host device is attached to the device. A second mode is entered when two host devices are attached to the device. Lin teaches detecting the connection of a host (controller) on two ports but does not teach detecting the presence of a peripheral device attached to a port. Furthermore Lin does not teach using a predetermined waiting period for determining the connection of a connection port and reconfiguring said connection port responsive thereto.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan M. Stiglic whose telephone number is 571.272.3641. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on 571.272.3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RMS